Street Car Advertising.—In Burns *v.* St. Paul City Railway Company, 112 Northwestern Reporter, 412, the Minnesota Supreme Court refused an injunction sought by a newspaper publisher to restrain a street railroad company from carrying advertisements in its cars. The court says that counsel for plaintiff in the case stated with a "refreshing vivacity" and a "rather surprising plausibility" that the application for the injunction was not "a path-breaker," but that the path was not only "broken" but "well paved—macadamized—with precedents;" but the court was, however, of the opinion that the cases cited were not in point, and refused to grant the injunction, even though the action of the street car company in carrying advertisements in its cars was ultra vires.

Right of State to Enjoin Pollution of Air.—In State of Georgia *v.* Tennessee Copper Company, 27 Supreme Court Reporter, 618, 206 U. S. 230, 51 L. Ed. 1038, the United States Supreme Court lays down the proposition that a foreign corporation will be enjoined at the suit of the state of Georgia from so discharging sulphurous fumes from its works in Tennessee as to pollute the air over large tracts of territory in Georgia, and to cause and threaten wholesale damage to forests and vegetable life therein, if not to health. When the states by their union made the forcible abatement of outside nuisances impossible to each, they did not thereby agree to submit to whatever might be done. They did not renounce the possibility of making reasonable demands on the ground of their still remaining quasi sovereign interests, and the alternative to force is a suit in the United States Supreme Court.

Protection of Proprietary Medicine.—In Moxie Nerve Food Company *v.* Modox, 152 Federal Reporter, 493, the United States Circuit Court for the District of Rhode Island lays down the proposition that a maker of a proprietary medicine, seeking the aid of a court of equity in the protection of his trademark rights, should be required, as a part of its affirmative case, to allege and prove that its preparation is what it purports to be; there being no presumption that such representations are true upon which a court can act. The court says: "If a complainant seeks protection in the sale of bottled goods, he should be willing to swear that his bottles contain what he represents to the public that they contain, and that his goods are in fact what they are sold for."

Liability of Restaurant Keeper for Ejecting Patron.—A restaurant keeper whose waiters eject a patron who annoys other patrons of the restaurant is not liable unless excessive force is used, according to the recent decision of the Supreme Court of Washington in Chase *v.* Knabel, 90 Pacific Reporter, 642. The court says that a restaurant keeper owes it to his patrons to protect them from annoyance.